REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Specification

As requested by the Examiner, the information concerning co-pending applications on pages 1, 2, 12-14, 18 and 22 of the specification has been updated. Also, the patent number issued to Bennett et al. at page 19 of the specification has been corrected.

Abstract

As requested by the Examiner, the abstract has been amended to delete the reference to "Figure 8". Also, minor changes to the phrasing of the abstract have been made. No new matter has been added.

Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-34. By this amendment, claims 1, 4-7, 20-24, and 26 have been amended. Therefore claims 1-34 remain pending in the application.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 3-7, 20-24, and 26 for various minor informalities. The informalities have been corrected in the currently amended claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-11, 15, 17-18, 20-29 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al. (USPN: 6,288,716 B1) (hereinafter referred to as "Humpleman"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner cites Humpleman as disclosing, at col. 17, lines 63-67, a method of "receiving, in the computer system, indicating data from a sensing device regarding the identity of the control interface and a position of the sensing device relative to the control interface, the sensing device, when placed in an operative position relative to the control interface, generating the indicating data using at least some of the coded data" (from amended claim 1 of the present application). However, the above step from claim 1 of the present application is neither disclosed nor suggested in Humpleman.

At col. 17, lines 63-67, Humpleman discloses a session manager that includes a device button 712. The session manager of Humpleman requires a Graphical User Interface (GUI) in a physical device such as a cathode ray tube (CRT) or liquid crystal display (LCD) (see, e.g., FIG. 11) to provide a primary interface between a user and a home network (see, e.g., col. 14, 27-28). The session manager and device button 712 of Humpleman therefore do not correspond with the control interface including coded data and the sensor device as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

14

By the present amendment, independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to clarify that the control interface of the present invention includes coded data indicative of <u>a</u> <u>plurality of reference points</u>. Support for these amendments is found in the specification at page 12, lines 14-25:

"...the preferred form of the netpage system employs a computer interface in the form of a mapped surface, that is, a physical surface which contains references to a map of the surface maintained in a computer system. The map references can be queried by an appropriate sensing device. Depending upon the specific implementation, the map references may be encoded visibly or invisibly, and defined in such a way that a local query on the mapped surface yields an unambiguous map reference both within the map and among different maps. The computer system can contain information about features on the mapped surface, and such information can be retrieved based on map references supplied by a sensing device used with the mapped surface. The information thus retrieved can take the form of actions which are initiated by the computer system on behalf of the operator in response to the operator's interaction with the surface features."

Claims 1 and 20 have further been amended to state that "the sensing device... ~~senses~~ generates the indicating data...." The purpose of that amendment is to clarify that the indicating data is derived from the coded data. Support for that amendment is found in the specification at page 21, lines 25-31:

"A location-indicating tag contains a tag ID which, when translated through the tag map associated with the tagged region, yields a unique tag location within the region. The tag-relative location of the pen is added to this tag location to yield the location of the pen within the region. This in turn is used to determine the location of the pen relative to a user interface element in the page description associated with the region. Not only is the user interface element itself identified, but a location relative to the user interface element is identified."

That paragraph describes an embodiment of the present invention where the coded data of claim 1 is identified as a "tag" and where the sensing device of claim 1 is identified as a "pen".

The sensing device of amended claims 1 and 20 thus generates indicating data by first determining "a position of the sensing device relative to the control interface" (see amended claims 1 and 20). The position of the sensing device is determined using the plurality of reference points as described in the amended claims 1 and 20. Nowhere does Humpleman disclose or suggest generating indicating data by first determining a position of a sensing device relative to an interface. Rather, Humpleman discloses the use of a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to allow users to command and control home devices (see, e.g., col. 14, lines 30-31). Humpleman does not disclose how a user interacts with a GUI and Humpleman clearly does not disclose interacting with a GUI through the use of a sensing device that determines its position relative to a control interface.

Similarly, the sensing device of independent claims 4-5 and 23-24 sense coded data that determines either movement of the sensing device relative to the control interface or the identify of the control interface. Again, Humpleman does not disclose or suggest such relationships between a sensing device and a control interface.

15

Further, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's remaining rejections based on Humpleman, of the claims depending from the above independent claims, are moot in light of the current amendments to the claims and the above arguments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 12-13, 19, 30-31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Redford et al. (USPN: 5,839,905) (hereinafter Redford). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner cites Humpleman in view of Redford as disclosing the limitation of printing a control interface on demand by referring to the printed publications of Redford that include printed content and one or more buttons connected to a remote control circuitry (col. 2, lines 46-55). However, the applicant respectfully asserts that the printed content and one or more buttons of Redford are very different from the printed control interface of the present application. The printed text of Redford is plain printed text and does not include features resembling or analogous to the coded data of the present application. Further, the buttons of Redford are actual physical buttons that are not at all similar to the coded data of the present invention. See, e.g., Redford at col. 10, lines 35-37: "Physical attachment 14A and visual association 14B can be implemented by gluing a button to a page adjacent to associated printed text and/or graphic content"; also at col. 11, line 66 through col. 12, line 1: "Picture book remote control 100 includes remote control circuitry (not shown in FIG. 1B) supported by printed publication 101 and connected to button 104."

The printed control interfaces of the present application are thus very different from the plain printed text that is disclosed in Redford and that accompany the physical buttons of Redford. The control interfaces of the present application include coded data, such as position data, that can be used to identify a parameter such as the volume level of a device. Neither the printed text of Redford nor the session manager of Humpleman discloses or suggests such coded data.

Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to clarify that the control interfaces of the claims include a plurality of reference points that may be used to first identify a position of a sensing device relative to the control interface, and then to generate indicating data using the known position of the sensing device. The remaining independent claims of the present invention sense coded data that determines either movement of the sensing device relative to the control interface or the identify of the control interface. None of these relationships between a control interface and a sensing device are disclosed or suggested in any of the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

_____
PAUL LAPSTUN

_____
JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

_____
KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
              393 Darling Street
              Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762